



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2022

by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PGCERT (Arch con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3282628

1 Brook Lane, Sheffield S12 4LF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Crownshaw against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02119/FUL, dated 5 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed single storey side extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application is dated 5 May 2102. However, it is clear from the ownership form, that the application is dated 5 May 2021 and a typing error has occurred. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area, including the Hackenthorpe Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site consists of a detached brick-built dormer bungalow in a residential area. Brook Lane is a narrow, predominantly single track no-through road that descends from Beighton Road. The character of the surrounding area is varied, with modern suburban 2 storey dwellings of mixed materials at Brook Green and Greenside Mews, juxtaposed with older buildings. Dwellings along the eastern side of Brook Lane are single storey or dormer bungalows of individual designs and mixed materials, with large front gardens set behind low boundary walls. It is a quiet, suburban location with planting contributing to the pleasant, green character.
5. The site lies outside but close to the boundary of the Hackenthorpe Conservation Area (CA) which runs along Beighton Road to the north of the appeal site. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The significance of the CA lies in its historic street pattern, buildings of architectural and historical interest, mature trees, stone boundary walls and the village green.

6. My attention has been drawn to the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG, 1996) which sets out detailed guidance on extensions to dwellings. Guidelines 1 and 2 seek to ensure extensions are compatible with and do not detract from the dwelling or the appearance of the street or locality, whilst guideline 3 requires matching materials and features in extensions.
7. The dwelling would be extended to the side and approximately 6.5m (as cited by the Council) forwards of the front elevation. The combination of the relatively narrow but considerable forward projection of the gable, would produce an incongruous extension that would unbalance the dwelling and draw the eye to a negative degree. When combined with the proximity of the properties on Greenside Mews and their higher ground level on the opposite side of Brook Lane, the development would enclose the currently spacious setting of the dwelling and the street scene in this location. Although the ridge of the roof would be set down, it would do little to limit the overall scale of the development. A lack of openings to articulate the north-eastern elevation would also intensify the scale of the development and be at odds with the front of the dwelling, which has a greater relationship of glazing to walling.
8. For the reasons described above, the extension would be conspicuous and obtrusive, particularly in views from the CA at the top of Brook Lane. This vista provides medium to long distance views out of the CA to the verdant woodland and hills to the south, which would be impeded by the development. Views into the CA, particularly of the crowns of the village green trees, would be also impacted but to a limited extent. Despite the presence of modern development around the CA, the impact of the development would still be negative. Whilst the extension would be constructed of matching materials, this would not overcome the harm arising from the position, form and detailing of the development. In the words of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the harm would be less than substantial but nevertheless important, given the negative effect on the setting of the CA. No public benefits have been put forward to weigh against the harm identified. The proposal would fail to comply with the Framework as a result.
9. Dwellings on the eastern side of Brook Lane generally follow a consistent building line, evident from my visit. The detached garage of 7 Brook Lane is an exception, being sited at 90 degrees and next to the lane. It is partially screened by the difference in ground levels and boundary walls, one of which indicates the garage possibly occupies the site of a previous, older building. The garage is low, nestling into the street scene so it is not conspicuous. It would not be comparable with the development proposed.
10. Although I have been referred to a planning approval for a forward extension of 3m at 21 Brook Lane, no detailed information regarding this permission has been provided. Nevertheless, the forward projection differs significantly in depth from the current proposal. The appellant also suggests that the surfacing of front gardens along Brook Lane has impacted the openness of the street scene, particularly when cars are parked. Vehicles are transient and generally lower than the extension proposed which would be a solid, permanent development. These matters would not alter my findings on this appeal.
11. I conclude that the proposed extension would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area, including the Hackenthorpe

Conservation Area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP, 1998), Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and Guidelines 1 and 2 of the SPG. These policies and guidance collectively seek, amongst other matters, to ensure extensions are well designed and in scale and character with the original and surrounding buildings. The development would also conflict with Policies BE15 and BE16 of the UDP, which aim to ensure that new development affecting the setting of a CA or significant views into or out of the CA, would be preserved or enhanced. Conflict is also found with paragraphs 130 and 197 of the Framework which promote good design, require development to be sympathetic to local character, and to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conclusion

12. As a whole, there are no considerations that would warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR